

REMARKS

The claims have been amended to recite a relief "surface" in order to avoid the rejection based upon indefiniteness.

The claims stand rejected over Satran et al. '672, the rejection asserting that Satran et al. discloses a relief face generally at 19 or 20 in Fig. 4. The specification of Satran et al. employs the numerals 19, 20 to describe cutting edges. If the Official action was intended to assert that the surface 15 constitutes a relief surface, then attention is directed to column 4, lines 50-51 of Satran et al. which describes the surface 15 as a rake surface (i.e., a chip surface along which the chips flow). The presently claimed invention is markedly different, because the surface 8a is a relief surface, not a rake surface. Also, in the present invention, the side surface 4 is the rake surface along which the chips will flow, whereas the corresponding surface in Satran et al. is a relief surface.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the present claims distinguish patentably over Satran et al.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: October 18, 2004

By: 

Alan E. Kopecki
Registration No. 25,813

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620